

reference to Figure 1 of the Grealish patent. There is nothing in this figure that suggests that data imported from a database is grouped into categories. The figure only pertains to the architecture of a personal computer, and its corresponding description does not discuss databases, let alone the categorization of data in databases.

Moreover, the Office Action does not even address the claimed concept that statistical information about retrieved records is displayed "by the selected categories" that are used to retrieve those records. The Office Action notes that the Keith patent discloses a visual distinction between clusters of statistically related concepts. However, it does not establish that this visual representation has any relationship to categories that are used to select records from a database. The statistical techniques discussed at column 29 of the Keith patent, such as cluster analysis, do not have any applicability to the database representations shown in Figures 2a-2e of the Grealish patent.

For at least these reasons, the Office Action has not established that the Grealish and Keith patents disclose all of the features of the rejected claims for which they are being relied upon. While the foregoing arguments have been presented in the context of claim 1, independent claim 13 also recites analogous distinguishing features of the invention.

New claims 27 and 28 recite further distinctions that are not disclosed nor otherwise suggested by the references. For instance, claim 27 recites that data is imported from plural databases into the internal database, and that the patent data retrieved from different ones of these plural databases is selectively merged into the same column of the internal database, or imported into different respective columns of the internal database, in accordance with a user designation. The claim also recites that citations in patents whose data has been imported into the internal database are determined, and that data relating to the determined citations is retrieved from at least one of the pre-existing accessible databases, and imported into the internal database. It is respectfully submitted that these claimed features are not taught by the Grealish, Keith and Unger patents, in addition to the distinguishing features discussed previously.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 29, 2008

By: /James A. LaBarre/  
James A. LaBarre  
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620